

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

|          |   |      |              |
|----------|---|------|--------------|
| Case No. | CV 25-2515 PA (AJRx)                            | Date | May 14, 2025 |
| Title    | Melanie Tandoc, et al. v. U.S. Renal Care, Inc. |      |              |

---

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Present: The Honorable | PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
|------------------------|--|

---

|                       |     |     |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|
| Kamilla Sali-Suleyman | N/A | N/A |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|

|              |                |          |
|--------------|----------------|----------|
| Deputy Clerk | Court Reporter | Tape No. |
|--------------|----------------|----------|

|                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: | Attorneys Present for Defendants: |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

|      |      |
|------|------|
| None | None |
|------|------|

**Proceedings:** IN CHAMBERS – COURT ORDER

It appears that Melanie Tandoc (“M. Tandoc”) is a named plaintiff asserting claims on her own behalf, claims as the successor-in-interest to the Arthur Tandoc estate, and on behalf of JT, a minor, as JT’s guardian ad litem. Because M. Tandoc has her own claims, and is pursuing claims on behalf of the decedent’s estate, in addition to her role in pursuing claims as the guardian ad litem for the minor, the Court is concerned that she may be operating under a conflict of interest concerning the minor’s claim. See Garrick v. Weaver, 888 F.2d 687, 693 (10th Cir. 1989); see also United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land, 795 F.2d 796, 805 (9th Cir. 1986) (“Where the Court identifies a potential conflict, it has a legal obligation to consider whether a minor’s (or incompetent’s) interests are adequately protected.”).

Accordingly, the Court orders M. Tandoc to show cause in writing why the Court should not vacate her appointment as guardian ad litem. M. Tandoc’s response to this Order to Show Cause shall be filed by no later than May 28, 2025. In the alternative, plaintiffs response to the Order to Show Cause by seeking to obtain the Court’s authorization to substitute a guardian ad litem who is not operating under a conflict of interest. If plaintiffs face difficulty in locating a suitable substitute guardian ad litem, they may consider seeking appointment of a guardian ad litem from the Probate Volunteer Panel of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.